The Examiner has supplied a translation of Yukio, and takes Fig. 7 of the application as the drawing of Yukio. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(1) Yukio/Fig. 7 differs from the instant claims in that the Applicant recites holding members.

Regarding this difference, Takashi teaches that U-shaped conductive clips 13 are used to pinch both the first glass substrate 4 (corresponding to the first substrate of the Applicant) and the wiring base board 7, which is provided on the outer surf ace of the first glass substrate 4. (Takashi's clips 13/13B that are adapted to slide onto the edges of the glass substrate 4 and the wiring base board 7, and compress them together as seen in Fig. 9 and the cover figure. From the Office Action at page 4, 3rd line from the bottom, the Examiner takes 13 and 13B as being the same part.)

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to replace the connecters 120 of Yukio with the conductive clips 13 of Takashi to reach the present claims.

(2) However, while the conductive clips 13 of Takashi are intended to pinch a plurality of substrates (i.e., the first glass substrate 4 and the wiring base board 7), the holding members of the present claims are not intended to pinch a plurality of substrates. Rather, the claimed holding members hold only the first substrate, and the top surfaces of the holding members are inserted between the first substrate and the second substrate, a feature that is claimed ("each holding member includes a portion inserted between the transparent first substrate and the second substrate").

Accordingly, even if the conductive clips 13 of Takashi were applied to the touch panel of Yukio, the clips 13 would merely be arranged to pinch the second

substrate 110 and the first substrate 130. Therefore, even if a person skilled in the art would have attempted to combine the references (not admitted), the claims could not have been reached. That person would not have conceived of inserting the top surfaces of the holding members between the first substrate and the second substrate, and arranging the inserted portions in contact with the lead-out terminals provided on either the first substrate or the second substrate, as claimed.

Further, the conductive clips 13 of Takashi are located on the edge of the first glass substrate 4; but this first glass substrate 4 and the second glass substrate 3 (corresponding to the second substrate of the present invention), between which liquid crystal is held, are completely different in size. The conductive clips 13 are positioned on an overhang of the first glass substrate 4, that extends beyond the edge of the second glass substrate 3. For this further reason also, Takashi does not suggest holding the top surfaces of the conductive clips 13 between the first glass substrate 4 and the second glass substrate 3 (i.e., inserting the conductive clips between the first glass substrate 4 and the second glass substrate 3).

In sum, applying the conductive clips 13 of Takashi to the touch panel of Yukio would not have been obvious.

(3) Furthermore, the proposed combination is unworkable: The clips 13 could *not* be used to replace the connector 120 of Yukio because they would not slide in between two substrates 110, 130 at the opening of the "insert part 142" of Yukio (this phrase "insert part," found in paragraph 0015 of Yukio, might imply that something is inserted). The prongs of the clip 13 (i.e., the legs of the general "U" shape) have

rounded inner contact portions and sharp ends that stick out, and these sharp ends would catch at the edges of the substrates when the clips 13 were inserted into the insert part 142. Even if the clips 13 could possibly be forced to slide in, they would cause leaks and/or scrape holes in the contact material 114, 134 (which possibly is of the same material as the sputtered resistance films 111, 131).

(4) The sharp-end clips 13 are not shown in position between two substrates and therefore do not anticipate the "holding member ... portion inserted between the transparent first substrate and the second substrate," as is recited in claim 1. No such element is disclosed in any of the references.

(5) The rejection of claim 3 is, with respect, incorrect. The insert part 142 is not a notch in the substrates as claimed, it is a notch in the "spacer 140" (Yukio paragraph 0015). The rejection of claim 11, that depends from claim 3, is also respectfully submitted to be incorrect.

(6) Regarding the rejection of claim 4, the Examiner assumes that the force of the clip 13 is so strong as to deform the glass substrate. However, there is no evidence for this. Glass will generally shatter or spall when pressed strongly at one point, rather than be deformed into grooves as the Examiner asserts.

Response to Argument. On pages 9/10 of the Action, the Examiner advises, "better claiming the clips and how they interact through the notched areas to the lead-out terminals." The Examiner is thanked for this suggestion for advancing the prosecution. However, the Applicant believes that claim 1 rather than claim 3 is patentable, such that the notched areas need not be claimed; and requests

reconsideration especially of the last paragraph of claim 1, that recites holding members on a single edge of *one* substrate.

The Examiner is invited to note that, while holding members on the second substrate are not excluded by the claim language, the language covers what the holding members on the edge of the first substrate do (*holding members* [that] *sandwich a periphery of the transparent first substrate, the holding members* [i.e., those that are on the edge of the first substrate] *being ... arranged so that each holding member includes a portion inserted between the transparent first substrate and the second substrate and in contact with at least one respective lead-out terminal of either the first or second substrate*). The claims do not recite clips on both substrates that make electrical contact with their respective substrates—but that is what a combination of the references (not admitted) would lead to.

Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Nick Bromer

Nick S. Bromer
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,478

NSB/lrj
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE